



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,936	11/08/2001	Patrick M. Flaherty	GW/05P2	4801

26875 7590 03/02/2004

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/008,936

Applicant(s)

FLAHERTY ET AL.

Examiner

Phong H Nguyen

Art Unit

3724

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on th cover sheet with th correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson et al. (4,627,214).

Regarding claims 1, 14, 15, and 21-26, Anderson et al. teach a slitting machine comprising a frame having an upper frame and a lower frame, an upper and lower drive shafts 35, a drive motor 47, a plurality of knife holder assemblies 30 and 31, a plurality of rotary knives, a knife holder position adjustment system 51 and 24, a frame adjustment mechanism 41 for vertical adjustment of the upper and the lower frame, and a programmable controller for positioning the knife holder assemblies along the respective drive shafts. See Figs. 1, 2, 5, and col. 4, lines 53-69.

Regarding claim 2, an upper frame and a lower frame are best seen in Fig. 1.

Regarding claim 5, the knife holder assemblies are adjustable independently. See Fig. 1.

Regarding claims 16-20, the frame adjustment mechanism for vertical adjustment of the upper and the lower frame is best seen in Figs. 3, 4, and 9; and col. 6, lines 15-58.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 3, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (4,627,214) in view of Brando (5,88,268).

Anderson et al. teach a slitting machine comprising a frame having an upper frame and a lower frame, an upper and lower drive shafts 35, a drive motor 47, a plurality of knife holder assemblies 30 and 31, a plurality of rotary knives, a knife holder position adjustment system 51 and 24, a frame adjustment mechanism 41 for vertical adjustment of the upper and the lower frame, and a programmable controller for positioning the knife holder assemblies along the respective drive shafts. See Figs. 1, 2, and col. 4, lines 53-69. Anderson et al., however, teach using racks 24 and pinions 51 for the knife holder position adjustment system but not the threaded shafts. Brando teaches art equivalence of threaded shafts and racks and pinions. See Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 10-24. Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute racks and pinions for threaded shafts since they are equivalent as suggested by Brando.

A plurality of motors 50 for knife holder assemblies 30 and 31 are best seen in Fig. 1 in Anderson et al. The ball nuts for use with threaded shafts are best seen in Fig. 3 in Brando.

4. Claims 7-14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al. (4,627,214) in view of Chambers (5,637,068). Anderson et al. teach a slitting machine comprising a frame having an upper frame and a lower frame, an upper and lower drive shafts 35, a drive motor 47, a plurality of knife holder assemblies 30 and 31, a plurality of rotary knives, a knife holder position adjustment system 51 and 24, a

frame adjustment mechanism 41 for vertical adjustment of the upper and the lower frame, and a programmable controller for positioning the knife holder assemblies along the respective drive shafts. See Figs. 1, 2, and col. 4, lines 53-69. Anderson et al., however, does not teach a plurality of drive shaft section each being coupled through a coupling mechanism. Chambers teaches a blade assembly comprising a plurality of drive shaft sections each being coupled through a coupling mechanism so that the blade assembly is readily disassembled for sharpening or other maintenance. See Figs. 11, 12 and col. 6, lines 21-67. Therefore, it would have been obvious to substitute a one segment shaft for as blade assembly as taught by Anderson et al. by a multi-segment shaft for a blade assembly as taught by Chambers so that an operator can disassemble the blade assembly for sharpening or other maintenance quickly.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on 12/08/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding arguments with respect to claims 1, 6 and 25, the claims are interpreted that the first knife holder is supported by one pair of the inner or the outer pairs of upper rail supports and the second knife holder is supported by one pair of the inner or the outer pairs of lower rail supports. Either pairs 26 or 27 can be called as an inner pairs of rail supports.

Regarding arguments with respect to claims 7, 13, 14 and 23, Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3724

Regarding arguments with respect to claims 15, 21, 22, 24 and 26, the upper frame being pivotally coupled to the lower frame to adjust relative vertical positioning of the first and second knife holder assemblies is best seen Figs. 3, 4, and 9; and col. 6, lines 15-58 in Anderson.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phong H Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4989. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PN: *pn*

February 19, 2004



Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700